

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over the patent to Kubota.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Kubota as well.

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Kubota in view of the patent to Borrelli.

Also, the disclosure is objected to.

In connection with the Examiner's objection to the disclosure, applicants have amended the disclosure to provide a correct identification for cerium. It is believed that the Examiner's grounds for the objection to the specification should be considered as no longer tenable.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims over the art, applicants have amended the claims to more clearly define the present invention.

It is specifically defined in claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 that the core is doped with cerium as well as with laser-active ions selected from the group consisting of neodym, thulium, holmium, ytterbium, and praseodym.

Turning now to the references and particular to the patent to Kubota, it can be seen that this reference discloses an optical waveguide with a core being doped with both erbium and cerium. In contrast, in accordance with the applicant's invention as defined now in claims 1 and 4, erbium is not used for doping with laser-active ions.

It is therefore believed to be clear that the new features of the present invention which are now defined in claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 are not disclosed in the patent to Kubota. Also, these features can not be derived from the patent to Kubota as a matter of obviousness.

The patent to Borrelli also does not teach the new features of the present invention as now defined in amended claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7. It is

therefore believed that none of the references teaches the new features of the present invention as defined in the independent claims, and these features can not be derived from the references as a matter of obviousness.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233